BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MINUTES

The Board of Architectural Review held its regularly scheduled meeting on April 17, 2008 at 15 N. Cameron Street, at 4:00 p.m. in Council Chambers, Rouss City Hall

PRESENT: P. Farris, C. Shore, T. Bandyke, L. Saunders, L. Belkin, M. Lore

ABSENT: T. Rockwood

VISITORS: Hunter Hurt, Stan Corneal, Richard Oram, Debra Johnson, Sandra Bosley (PHW), Stephanie Mangino (Winchester Star)

MINUTES: The Minutes of April 3, 2008 were reviewed. Mr. Farris, seconded by Mr. Bandyke motioned for approval of the minutes as amended. Motion carried 6-0.

Mr. Saunders suggested moving all the Historic Plaques to the Consent Agenda. This was agreeable to all members.

CONSENT AGENDA

HP-08-01 Request of Roger and Suzanne Vaughan for placement of a historical plaque at 319 N. Braddock St.

HP-08-02 Request of Thomas and Christine Chasler for placement of a historic plaque at 124 W. Boscawen St.

HP-08-03 Request of Richard Oram & Debra Johnson for placement of a historic plaque at 101 N Loudoun St.

HP-08-04 Request of Richard Oram & Debra Johnson for placement of a historic plaque at 209 S Braddock St.

HP-08-05 Request of Dale Massey for placement of a historic plaque at 125 E. Piccadilly St.

Mr. Belkin asked about a checklist that has previously been made available, sighting requirements for the plaques.

Mr. Grisdale gave the Board the requirements as stated in the Ordinance.

Mr. Farris, seconded by Mr. Bandyke motioned to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to HP-08-01; HP-08-02; HP-08-03; HP-08-04 and HP-08-05.

Motion carried unanimously 6-0.

NEW BUSINESS

BAR-08-27 Request of Debra Johnson to demolish a portion of the building including the shed at 116-118 S. Braddock St. ****PUBLIC HEARING ITEM****

Mr. Saunders abstained.

Mr. Belkin opened the public hearing.

Stan Corneal, representing the applicant, stated that the free-standing barn and boiler room is to be demolished. He felt that neither have any historic significance and the barn portion is in very poor condition. Neither is salvageable.

Mr. Belkin asked what was motivating the demolition.

Mr. Corneal explained that the building is for sale and that's what the purchasers are requesting. The buildings aren't being used for anything, it would clean everything up. The only thing holding up the barn is the metal framing.

Mr. Belkin closed the public hearing.

Mr. Bandyke asked if the chimney would be taken down in the demolition.

Mr. Corneal stated that from the pictures he couldn't really tell if any part of it was connected to the boiler room. At this point there is no plan to remove it.

Mr. Lore read from the applicant's letter, stating that it says that the demolition will be required for site improvements. He asked what is proposed for the site.

Mr. Corneal stated that the purchasers have expressed an interest of replacing the buildings but nothing is concrete. He added that the portions aren't well built. It is all nailed together; it's obvious that it wasn't meant to be there for a long period of time.

Mr. Farris agreed with Mr. Corneal. He felt that if the demolition is denied and they are forced to repair the structures, they would be completely new structures. There would be nothing historic left.

Mr. Belkin stated that he felt the same way. Even though the building was built in the 1920's he didn't feel that it was intended to stand for a long period of time. He expressed his willingness to grant the request however he asked that it be tabled until the Board is able to see the plan for the site to make sure something other than a parking lot is proposed.

Mr. Lore asked if the applicant wanted to demolish the buildings to put up a parking area to increase property value would the Board be able to say no.

Mr. Belkin answered by saying that he would at least be able to see a plan for a parking lot or at least be able see the thought process behind it.

Mr. Corneal stated that there is a possibility that another building will be placed there but it will not be a replacement barn. It's better to take the buildings down to enable the renovation of the main building that's in really good shape. He felt it would be better to have it restored than sitting there vacant.

Mr. Bandyke asked if the brick portion is straddling the property line.

Mr. Corneal stated that its two property address, it could be divided from Braddock to Indian Alley. He stated that based on the survey it looks like its straddling.

Mr. Bandyke asked it there is deeded off-street parking for these buildings.

Mr. Grisdale stated that this property is in the parking exempt district.

Mr. Farris expressed his lack of concern with what's replacing these buildings because they couldn't be easily restored.

Mrs. Shore stated that she has no problem with the demolition request.

Mr. Lore stated that the Board would never request that a duplicate shed be put back there. He felt the only option is to tear them down. He felt that the additions clash with the main building.

Mr. Lore, seconded by Mr. Farris to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for BAR-08-27 to demolish the shed and back portion of the building as proposed because they do not meet any of the required criteria as stated in the Historic District Design Guidelines.

Motion carried unanimously 5-1. (Mr. Saunders abstaining)

BAR-08-28 Request of Lafayette Plaza LLC to present front façade ground floor retail area plans.

Hunter Hurt, architect, presented a new drawing for the front façade of the old Taylor Hotel.

Mr. Bandyke asked how high the store fronts are without the transoms.

Mr. Hurt stated that they are 8 feet.

Mr. Bandyke stated that he really liked the transoms however he can see how they will interfere with the possible window displays.

Mr. Belkin stated that he thought it looked a little plain. He asked whether it would be possible to have a wood run under the windows instead of brick or maybe something about the window and the transom.

Mr. Hurt stated that there is a wood base under the window but all of this is subject to what the shop owner requests.

Mr. Belkin suggested a few ideas to enhance the architecture.

Mr. Hurt stated that any additional columns would take away from the porches. He felt that simple is better.

Mr. Saunders stated that there will be many changes before all the space is leased out. He didnt feel that this is the end.

Mr. Belkin suggested simply accepting the openings.

Mr. Saunders suggested that this be conceptually approved and go from there.

Mr. Hurt stated that he is willing to come back when he has at least one tenant in there.

Mr. Lore, seconded by Mrs. Shore motioned to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for BAR-08-28, the spacial opening of the east elevation as submitted.

Motion carried unanimously 5-0. (Mr. Farris left the meeting at 4:45)

BAR -08-29 Request of Edgehill Recovery Center to remove old and install new exterior egress stairs.

Hunter Hurt, architect stated that this is just a remove and replace except for adding a canopy over the stairs. All colors will match the new addition.

Mr. Belkin questioned a roof being required for the stairs.

Mr. Hurt explained that it is required, opened stairs aren't allowed. The law passed a couple years ago.

Mr. Belkin asked if the canopy will tie into the existing roof.

Mr. Hurt stated that it will. It will all be made of the same material.

Mr. Saunders stated that they have already approved a similar set of stairs on the other side of the building.

 $Mr.\ Bandyke,\ seconded\ by\ Mr.\ Lore\ motioned\ to\ grant\ a\ Certificate\ of\ Appropriateness\ BAR-08-29\ as\ per\ the\ drawings\ submitted.$

Motion carried unanimously 5-0.

BAR-08-30 Request of Dale Massey to install a bracketed hanging sign at 125 E. Piccadilly St.

Mr. Saunders asked if anyone representing the applicant was present.

Hearing none, Mr. Saunders pointed out that by looking at the measurements presented; the sign doesn't meet current ordinance standards.

Mr. Grisdale stated that staff would get in touch with the applicant and work out those issues.

Mr. Shore, seconded by Mr. Bandyke motioned to table BAR-08-30 until someone could be present.

Motion carried unanimously 5-0.

OLD BUSINESS

BAR-08-25 Request of Richard Oram & Debra Johnson to restore the front façade at 101 N Loudoun St.

Mr. Saunders expressed how pleased he was with what is being proposed.

Mr. Belkin agreed, stating this is a wonderful project. He stated that this project is an example of the reason there is a BAR. He stated that the documentation that was provided with the application was outstanding.

Mr. Lore agreed with Mr. Belkin. He stated that he has been waiting for this restoration to happen.

Mr. Belkin, seconded by Mr. Lore motioned to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for BAR-08-25 as presented.

Motion carried unanimously 5-0.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Mr. Lore brought up the dining area of the Thai Restaurant on the pedestrian mall. He stated that to him what they presented and what they put up are not the same.

Mr. Saunders recalled telling the applicant that they couldn't use plastic.

Mr. Belkin asked what that application showed as far as materials.

Mr. Grisdale stated it's to be resin.

Mr. Belkin asked if "resin" is an appropriate word for plastic.

Mr. Saunders wasn't sure.

Mr. Belkin stated that this area can be improved simply by adding a potted plant to the corners of the area.

Mr. Saunders stated that the applicant has been cooperative and thinks they will have no problem with that.

Mr. Lore stated that he doesn't want to make life hard for the applicant because they are just getting started but that area needs some disguise.

Mrs. Shore stated that another example of something that the Board approved that looks different than what they presented is the house near the old firehouse on North Loudoun. She didn't expect it to look so orange.

Mr. Saunders stated that he thought that they were simply replacing the bad boards.

Mr. Belkin asked that staff look into it and see if the approval was followed.

Mr. Saunders stated that the applicant my have to come back to the Board for color approval.

Mr. Bandyke remembered the application was very vague.

Meeting Adjourned 5:15 p.m.